

REMARKS

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2005 ("Office Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-28 for at least the following reasons. Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the previous prior art rejections based upon U.S. Patent 5,056,021 issued to Carolyn Ausborn.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims claim 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 16, 22, and 26 are objected to in the Office Action for including a number informalities. Claims 1-13, 18o 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 6, 12, 14-23, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit the claims as amended are devoid of the informalities identified by the Examiner and fully comply with the specific requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of this application.

RESPONSE TO THE OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objects to paragraph [2] of the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment of the specification. The Examiner asserts that the reference to "word 10" is in error and there is not a location in the drawings that indicates the reference numeral. Figure 1 of the drawings illustrates a string of bits that represents a word. Reference numeral 10 does in fact appear at the top of Figure 1 to refer to the entire bit string representing the words. Paragraph [1] of the Brief Description of the Drawings and paragraph [2] of the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments are amended to clearly set forth that word is represented by the bit string illustrated in Figure 1. The amended specification uses reference numeral 10 to refer to the bit string that represents the word.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [9] of the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment of the specification. The Examiner notes that the description does not accurately describe the Figure 3. The specification inadvertently reversed the terms "alternate root" and "base root" in the described example. The specification is amended to reverse these terms as

shown in Figure 3. This paragraph is also amended to correct a grammatical error identified by the Examiner.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [12] of the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment of the specification. The Examiner notes that the described example is not illustrated in the drawings. Accordingly, the Examiner objects to the use of the phrase “In the illustrated example.” The specification is amended to recite “In this example.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as amended is devoid of the informalities noted by the Examiner.

RESPONSE TO THE OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawing are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because they fail to show the reference to item 10 as described in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to the specification renders the objection to the specification moot. Figure 1 does include reference numeral 10. Figure illustrates a string of bits representing a word. The specification is amended to set forth that Figure 1 shows a string of bits representing a word.

RESPONSE TO THE OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 14, 16, 22, and 26 are objected to for including a number of informalities. Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s careful review of the claims and have amended the claims, with the exception of claim 22, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 22 however, does not include the language objected to by the Examiner. Claim 21 does include one of the informalities ascribed to claim 22 by the Examiner. Accordingly, claim 21 is amended to correct the informality. However, applicants do not find an informality in line 3 of “a plurality of fields.” Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are devoid of the amendments identified by the Examiner.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-13, 18, and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth “grouping a plurality of roots selected from the set of roots to form a word.” The Examiner notes that the specification at page 6, para. [7] describes that “Roots are combined to define words.” The Examiner asserts that this disclosure is insufficient to support the claim limitation of forming a word. The Examiner asserts that the combined roots do not form a word in the sense of generating the word. Applicants disagree. Applicants submit

that one of ordinary skill would understand that from the description of combining roots to define words that words are formed by grouping roots together. The Examiner advises applicants to specify where in the disclosure a word is formed from the roots. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure cited by the Examiner does in fact disclose forming combining roots to form a word. Furthermore, the specification at page 2, para [3], recites: "The roots are combined to form words." For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submits that claim as amended fully complies with the enablement requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 18 and 24-27 are rejected for the same reason as claim 1. Claims 2-7 and 28 stand rejected as being dependent on a rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments regarding claim 1 demonstrate that the rejection of these claims is erroneous.

The Examiner asserts that the recitation in claim 8 of "all concepts" is without bound. The amendment of claim 8 to delete the word "all" renders this rejection moot. Claims 9-13 are rejected as being dependant on claim 8. The amendment to claim 8 renders these rejections moot.

Claims 6, 12, 14-23, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner notes that "the tree-type taxonomy" in claim 6 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 6 is amended to refer to "the tree-type structure" originally introduced in claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that the recitation of "the negative" in claim 12 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 12 is amended to recite "negatively."

The Examiner asserts that the "the readable value" in line 6 of claim 14 renders the claim inconclusive. Claim 6 is amended to delete the reference to "the readable value."

The Examiner is unable to determine what is simultaneously occurring in claim 18. Claim 18 is amended to set forth "a processor including a register for receiving bits of data simultaneously." Applicants note that a register is a storage device in a processor. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that for example a 64-bit processor includes registers that simultaneously store 64 bits of data. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 as amended is definite.

The Examiner notes that the "the general abstract class" recited in claim 21 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 21 is amended to refer to "the general abstract classes" previously introduced in claim 21.

The Examiner asserts that "the step of combining" recited in both claims 27 and 28 lacks antecedent basis. Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 24. Applicants submit that the step of combining recited in claim 24 provides antecedent basis for the recitations in claims 27 and 28.

Applicants respectfully, assert that for at least the above reasons, the pending claims as amended fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.


CONCLUSION

The Office Action, objections and rejections have been duly considered by the applicants and addressed by the foregoing amendments and remarks. Reconsideration of the application and early allowance are respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner require resolution of any issues for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite the same. In the event any variance exists between the amount authorized to be charge to the Deposit Account and the Patent Office charges, please charge or credit any difference to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:


Thomas J. Scott, Jr.
Registration No 27,836

Dated: April 6, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)